

particular bracket motion. Either we decide these issues as they come up, or we just move them further down the line and considering that some of the senators have gotten together and Senator Ashford has agreed to withdraw his particular amendment, Senator Chizek has moved to withdraw his particular amendments, both of which would have taken a considerable amount of time of debate this morning as well as tomorrow morning, I think that Senator Ashford has acted in good faith and he is willing to push ahead with the bill and it doesn't appear that anyone else has any real concerns as to issues that could or could not be debated on this bill. The bill is there. Amendments could be thrown up before the body to debate today. I would urge the body to reject the bracket motion and let's move the bill. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Abboud. Next we have Senator Conway on the bracket motion.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I rise in opposition to the bracket motion. It became my understanding this morning that various individuals have been discussing the issue and came to the conclusion and to the agreement, if you will, that there are enough votes within the Judiciary Committee to take LB 262 and move it to the floor as a vehicle to deal with these, what I would have to call "asundrious" issues. Senator Warner described the fact that you can't separate policy from the application. I sat on the Judiciary Committee six years ago which was the first time I heard about the inspections problem. That bill has come forth. It has been a problem as viewed by the municipalities for many years and they have introduced their own legislation specific to that issue. Under current law, that problem is a problem under current law and they have been looking for a pony to put it on for a long time. This happens to be one where there happens to be a lot of people interested in it. It somewhat addresses the same area of law, but by the same token by the germaneness ruling, you can see not specifically. I think that that particular issue will have its opportunity to be debated under 262 and any of the other "asundrious" issues that are coming about. What LB 88 has formed itself into is a very specific piece of legislation dealing with the balance between slight and gross and joint and several and these other issues do nothing but complicate one's ability to really analyze the balance that has been brought forth by those two issues. I think that Senator Kristensen's amendment was a bit of a retreat on the part of one side of the